

TRANSMITTAL



Date: January 30, 1997

To: Distribution

From: Kathy Walsh

Re: Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes (January 16, 1997)

Per the request of Ronald Yee with the Department of the Navy, Engineering Field Activity West, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, the following information is enclosed with this transmittal memo:

Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) draft minutes for the January 16, 1997, meeting. The document will be finalized during the RAB meeting scheduled for February 20, 1997. The minutes include two attachments, as follows.

- A. The list of attendees and sign-in sheet for the January RAB meeting.
- B. The agenda for the RAB meeting scheduled for February 20, 1997.

If you have any questions regarding the enclosed, please contact Ronald Yee at (415) 244-2558, or John Rosengard, RAB Community Co-Chair at (510) 601-8740.

Distribution:

Ms. Elizabeth Robinson Anello
Mr. Steven Bachofer
Ms. Shirley Buford
Mr. Jim Campbell
Mr. George Delacruz
Mr. Scott Etzel
Mr. Craig Fletcher
Mr. John Fuery
Mr. Steve Gallo
Mr. Edward Gardner
Ms. Susan Gladstone
Mr. Neil Grindheim
Mr. James Koeppel
Mr. David Kory
Ms. Sylvia Kotecki
Mr. Eugene Kuroczko
Mr. Ralph Lambert
Mr. Marvin Mayfield
Dr. Eugenia McNaughton
Ms. Loulena Miles
Ms. Colleen Monahan
Ms. Nicole Moutoux
Mr. Larry Myers
Mr. Raymond O'Brien
Ms. Connie Peak

Mr. Richard Pieper
Mr. James Pinasco
Mr. Richard Purdue
Mr. David Rege
Ms. Tatiana Roodkowsky
Ms. John Rosengard
Ms. Catie Roy
Mr. James Serventi
Mr. Herb Schwartz
Mr. Thomas Shirley
Mr. Ronald Yee

**PLEASE NOTE THAT THE AD HOC RAB MEETING SCHEDULED
FOR FEBRUARY 8, 1997, HAS BEEN CANCELLED.**

**The monthly RAB meeting scheduled for February 20, 1997, is unchanged
and will be held as planned.**

**NAVAL WEAPONS STATION CONCORD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD**

MEETING MINUTES

**Ambrose Community Center
3105 Willow Pass Road
Bay Point, California**

Thursday, January 16, 1997

I. Welcome and Introductions

The Naval Weapons Station (NWS) Concord Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met on Thursday, January 16, 1997, at the Ambrose Community Center in Bay Point, California. Mr. Rich Pieper, the RAB Navy co-chair, opened the meeting at 7:15 p.m and noted that Mr. Rosengard had called to ask that the meeting start without him. All who were in attendance agreed that the meeting would begin with Dr. Dan Stralka's presentation on risk assessment, followed by administrative items and the co-chairs' report. A list of attendees and the sign-in sheet are attached to these minutes (see Attachment A). A copy of these meeting minutes is available for public review at the information repository located at the main branch of the Contra Costa County Library in Pleasant Hill.

II. Presentation on Risk Assessment

Dr. Dan Stralka of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) gave a presentation on risk assessment. Copies of the overheads from Dr. Stralka's presentation were distributed to all meeting attendees. Additional copies are available upon request. Dr. Stralka began his presentation by stating that he was prepared to speak about two main subjects, human health risk assessment and ecological risk assessment, but that he was primarily interested in addressing the questions or concerns of the RAB members. He offered to tailor his presentation according to questions and suggestions from the audience.

Ms. Sylvia Kotecki said that she was interested in hearing more about specific tests conducted during different seasons over a year's time. Dr. Stralka explained that in the summertime, when surface water flow has stopped, chemicals are more stationery (in ponded water) and more readily appear in testing results. After the first flush of rainfall, the constituents may be more mobile and may be cleared away from the areas tested. It is important to conduct strategic sampling. The sampling plan takes the seasons into account and has base sampling at different times throughout a year. Ms. Susan Gladstone added that the sampling plan also stipulates that sampling was to be conducted where there was ponded water.

Mr. Pieper asked if rainfall is considered when developing sediment criteria tables. Dr. Stralka responded that the sediment criteria tables are generally geared towards the most sensitive species. Mr. John Bosche (PRC Environmental Management, Inc. [PRC]) stated that preliminary remediation goals (PRG) are used for human health risk assessment.

Mr. Steve Gailo requested that Dr. Stralka explain the distinction between criteria for residential and industrial usage. Dr. Stralka explained that for a residential scenario, very conservative estimates are made regarding the type of exposure and toxicity present. For a residential scenario, the risks are overestimated. Whether a site is planned for residential reuse or for industrial reuse, data collected at the site is used to answer the questions: "Is there a significant health or environmental risk, now or in the future?" and "Are the risks immediate, long term, or both?"

Mr. Pieper described a scenario at a small polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB) contaminated site on NWS Concord. Four to five samples were taken and one sample contained PCBs. Twelve square feet of soil were excavated, and a concrete pad was placed at the site. He also described the situation at the Tidal Area Landfill. The Navy is looking at capping the landfill as a presumptive remedy, because it is a protective, low-cost solution. The Navy anticipates that a cap will adequately address the risks evaluated at the site.

Regarding the landfill cap proposed for the Tidal Area, Ms. Kotecki asked if ongoing maintenance of the cap will continue after the Navy relinquishes custody of the property. Dr. Stralka replied that future land use will be considered before the remedy is selected. In addition, Dr. Stralka noted that a landfill cap may provide additional beneficial use of the surface area once containment has occurred. Landfill caps are generally considered to be reasonably protective.

Dr. Stralka also explained that the "do nothing" option is always considered as a starting point. Risk evaluators always ask "Is there something to worry about?" If there is no possibility of exposure, there is no risk. This question and the corresponding assumptions used to answer it apply to both residential and industrial scenarios. He further explained that risk assessors consider the "background" at the site, that is to say the ambient or naturally-occurring levels of a constituent; these background levels are then compared to the current level of contamination to determine how much has been added to the site as a direct result of historical operations.

Mr. Pieper asked about the reliability of risk assessment studies. Dr. Stralka explained the science of risk assessment continues to develop. New data may suggest that a study should be reopened and that previous actions should be reconsidered. Dr. Stralka stated scientific findings or advances may prompt an action to be reconsidered. Mr. Pieper followed up by asking if EPA compiles and accumulates the data that advances the science of risk assessment. Dr. Stralka replied that universities and independent researchers play a predominant role in compiling data. Dr. Stralka also explained that in most cases, testing to determine the effects of exposure to specific constituents is performed on animals. Interpreting the results from studies on animals and then applying the results to humans involves a level of uncertainty. In some cases, as with lead, researchers are able to study humans who have been accidentally exposed. As a result, conclusions about the effects of human exposures to lead are assumed to be more accurate.

Mr. Pieper asked if individual conservatism is applied in the development of PRGs. Dr. Stralka explained that dose multiplied by toxicity is equal to risk. If researchers have access to data from human exposures, they do not have to add uncertainty or safety factors. EPA regulations are based on a 1 in 10,000 to a 1 in 1 million chance of seeing an effect, with different levels of uncertainty for different compounds. Mr. Pieper asked how well risk assessment deals with a mixture of various chemicals at different sites. Dr. Stralka answered that in calculating cumulative effects of toxicity, uncertainty is taken into account by dividing the toxicity by 10 to

allow for variability of receptors. When there is more than one chemical involved, the risks are added together. Effects can be synergistic, meaning the effects are greater than the sum of the effects of two or more chemicals, or antagonistic, meaning that the effect of one chemical may interfere with or lessen the effect of another.

Mr. Rosengard asked how the additive process is calculated. Dr. Stralka explained that risk assessors look at exposure; even when there is no possibility of current exposure, there may be pathways for exposure in the future. Mr. Rosengard asked what would happen in a situation where four sites are located hundreds of feet apart. Dr. Stralka stated that risk assessors would look at a worst case scenario and then assume an upper-end exposure to determine the potential risk.

Mr. Bosche asked if additional levels of conservatism are included when factoring from animals to humans. Dr. Stralka replied that a large number of animals are exposed to different levels of risk. Risk assessors attempt to determine what the effects of exposure will be and what may present the most significant effect. Toxicity numbers are used to derive PRGs, and because there may be multiple pathways of exposure, a worst-case scenario is assumed. In general, humans are assumed to be 10 times more sensitive than animals. Human variability is accounted for by adding another factor of 10, and if the no-effect level is unknown, another factor of 10 is taken.

Mr. Pieper asked if rats are the animal most commonly used for testing. Dr. Stralka stated that rats and mice are commonly used. He explained that these test animals have a life span of about 100 weeks. Tests are run to study chronic (long term) and acute (short term) exposures.

A RAB member asked about the difference between residential and industrial exposure pathways. Dr. Stralka explained that for a residential scenario, exposure is assumed to occur for 30 years, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. For an industrial scenario, exposure is assumed to occur for 25 years, 8 hours a day, 5 days a week.

In response to a question about how PRGs are calculated, Dr. Stralka used Site 13, the Burn Area, as an example scenario. Site 13 was previously used as a fire fighting training area and for burning napalm. Risk assessors looked at sampling results and identified detections above PRGs, that is, where concentrations are high enough to be a problem. At Site 13, five compounds were detected above residential PRGs. Benzo(a)pyrene (a product of incomplete combustion), residual metals from the combustion process, and naturally occurring levels of other metals were among the compounds found at the site. The cancer risk was determined to be 1 in 1 million at the existing concentrations. Dr. Stralka's risk evaluation was based upon remedial investigation data. Data from the site inspection indicates a higher degree of risk due to benzene in soil. Benzene impacted soil is proposed for cleanup to lower the site's human health risk.

Ms. Gladstone asked if PRGs account for airborne particulate transport to nearby residences. Dr. Stralka replied that PRGs assume that someone is living directly on the site, which would be a higher level of exposure than someone living nearby.

In summation, Dr. Stralka said that his talk had, for the most part, addressed human health risk assessment. He indicated that the same sort of process is carried out for ecological risk assessment. In assessing ecological risk, scientists investigate a variety of species to identify sensitive endpoints. In selecting endpoints, risk assessors consider what data is available, what

chemical effects are anticipated, and what physical stressors are present. Risk assessment uses conservative estimations to identify exposure and toxicity at a site, and many different factors must be considered. Risk assessors use data to answer the questions, "Is there a significant health or environmental risk posed at a site, now or in the future?" and "Are the risks immediate, long term, or both?"

Mr. Steve Bachofer asked how the RAB could obtain information about the assessment of bioavailability. Dr. Stralka responded that extraction tests are a standard method for determining bioavailability. Extraction tests look at the physical properties of a chemical (that is, its specific form) and the species in question. Bioavailability is then estimated and incorporated into the risk assessment.

III. Community Co-Chair's Report/Administrative Items

Mr. Rosengard began his co-chair report by thanking Dr. Stralka for his presentation. He invited comments from the audience; none were raised. Next, Mr. Rosengard welcomed Ms. Nicole Moutoux, the new remedial project manager from EPA. Ms. Moutoux works in the Navy Federal Facilities Branch at EPA. Dr. Eugenia McNaughton (EPA) will still be available to take questions from the RAB, and she will be continuing her work on the ecological risk assessment. The letter of appreciation from the RAB to Dr. Bobbye Smith will be completed for the next RAB meeting.

~~An ad hoc meeting of the RAB will take place on Saturday, February 8, 1997, at 9:00 a.m. Mr. Bosche will present an overview of the solid waste management unit (SWMU) report, and Dr. McNaughton will give a presentation on the Reference Marsh in lieu of the ecological risk assessment presentation originally scheduled to be given by Dr. Mary Gleason and Ms. Barbara Seotkoos of PRC. The meeting scheduled for February 8, 1997 was canceled.~~

Mr. Rosengard solicited agenda items for the next regularly scheduled RAB meeting to be held on Thursday, February 20, 1997. Ms. Kotecki said that Ms. Tatiana Roodkowsky had indicated she would invite a representative from Congressman Miller's and Congressman Baker's offices to speak about the proposal for partial deletion of NWS Concord from the National Priorities List. Mr. Rosengard indicated that he had received no further information on the matter.

Ms. Moutoux stated that she is looking into partial deletion from the EPA standpoint. She offered to present her findings at the February RAB meeting.

The technical assistance grant (TAG) process will be addressed in the spring of 1997; the TAG applicant has not had much success in completing the paper work.

Mr. Rosengard stated that Mr. Rich Purdue has a copy of the SWMU report, and Ms. Connie Peak has a copy of the Litigation Area qualitative ecological assessment report. He announced that additional copies of these reports are available to RAB members for review. In addition, the letter summarizing the RAB's comments on the Inland Area remedial investigation report is due on January 21, 1997.

Mr. Pieper raised the topic of the tour of the weapons station planned for April. He suggested that a date be set at the next RAB meeting to allow time to run newspaper notices and to determine the level of interest. RAB members discussed setting a date for the tour and decided

on Saturday, April 12, 1997. The tour will begin at 8:00 or 9:00 a.m. The start time and duration of the tour will be determined by the public relations (PR) committee. The PR committee will also prepare a plan of actions and milestones. Mr. Pieper will arrange the on-site logistics based on the number of respondents. He suggested the tour be limited to three buses or a maximum of 90 people. When the RAB conducted a tour in 1995, there were 140 respondents which necessitated the offering of two tours (90 on the first and 50 on the second).

Mr. Rosengard asked RAB members to provide him with their e-mail addresses so he could add them to the list of names and addresses he was planning to prepare.

As a final announcement, Mr. Rosengard stated that the RAB may be able to complete a video production on the environmental status at NWS Concord, depending on funding availability.

Dr. Stralka made available his phone number [(415) 744-2310] and encouraged attendees to call him with any questions regarding his presentation.

IV. Status of Action Items

Action Items Pending from the December RAB Meeting

- Ms. Roodkowsky will invite a representative from Congressman Miller's office and Congressman Baker's office to a future RAB meeting to present the political ramifications of partial delisting of NWS Concord from the NPL.
- Mr. Rosengard will invite an EPA representative to a future RAB meeting to provide information regarding partial delisting of NWS Concord from the NPL.
- Dr. McNaughton will write a letter formally requesting an extension of the comment period for the SWMU report and other documents.
- Mr. Pieper will have a plaque made to commemorate Dr. Smith's contribution to the RAB.

Action Items Identified at the January RAB Meeting

- The PR committee will prepare a plan of actions and milestones for the tour of the weapons station scheduled for Saturday, April 12, 1997.
- Mr. Rosengard will prepare an updated list of RAB member names, mailing addresses, and e-mail addresses for distribution at the February RAB meeting.
- Mr. Rosengard will distribute copies of the letter summarizing RAB comments on the Inland Area remedial investigation report.

V. Adjournment

Mr. Rosengard adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m. ~~An ad-hoc meeting for presentations on the SWMU report (Mr. Bosche) and the Reference Marsh (Dr. McNaughton) will be held on Saturday, February 8, 1997, at 9:00 a.m. at the NWS Concord Badge and Pass Office. The meeting scheduled for February 8, 1997 has been canceled.~~ The public relations committee will hold its monthly meeting on Monday, February 10, 1997 at 7:30 p.m. at the NWS Concord Badge and Pass Office. The next regularly scheduled RAB meeting will take place on Thursday, February 20, 1997, at 7:00 p.m. at the Ambrose Community Center.

ATTACHMENT A

**List of Attendees and Sign-In Sheet
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting
Thursday, January 16, 1997**

LIST OF ATTENDEES
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
Thursday, January 16, 1997

1. COMMUNITY MEMBERS

Mr. Steven Bachofer, Mr. Steve Gallo, Ms. Sylvia Kotecki, Ms. Connie Peak, and Mr. John Rosengard

2. NAVY MEMBERS

Mr. Richard Pieper (Naval Weapons Station Concord and Navy RAB Co-Chair) and Mr. Ronald Yee (Engineering Field Activity West)

3. REGULATORY AGENCY MEMBERS

Ms. Susan Gladstone (Regional Water Quality Control Board); Mr. James Pinasco (Department of Toxic Substances Control); Dr. Eugenia McNaughton, Ms. Nicole Moutoux, and Dr. Dan Stralka (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency)

4. OTHER ATTENDEES

Mr. John Bosche and Ms. Kathy Walsh (PRC Environmental Management, Inc.)

Naval Weapons Station Concord
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting
January 16, 1997

Please Sign In:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Sylvia Koticki	3648 Grantzotto	510 686-1964
Connie Plank	Concord 2520 Ryan Rd #35 Concord	6712598
Nicole Montoux	75 Hawthorne St SF, CA	415 744 2366
Rick Jensen	W. 2015th Concord (PRC)	(510) 246-5650
John Bosche	5 Science Ave	415 222-8295
Jim Pinson	D.TSC	916 855 3719
Eugene McNaughton	EPA	415-744-1636
Steve Gallo	925 Meadowdale Ct Martinez 94553	510-370-7969
John Rosengard	525 Hampton Piedmont	510 601.8740.
Kathy Walsh (PRC)	135 Main Street SF CA 94123	415. 222.8254
Steven J. Bachofer	20 Valley Cr. Pleasanton, CA	(510)-947-1453
Susan Gladstone	RWECB	510-286-0840

ATTACHMENT B

Agenda

**Restoration Advisory Board Meeting
Thursday, February 20, 1997**

DRAFT AGENDA
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION CONCORD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

Thursday, February 20, 1997

7:00 - 9:00 p.m.
Ambrose Community Center
3105 Willow Pass Road
Bay Point, California

7:00 - 7:05	Welcome and Introductions
7:05 - 7:15	Community Co-Chair's Report
7:15 - 7:25	Approval of December and January RAB Meeting Minutes
7:25 - 7:45	Presentation on Partial Deletion - (EPA)
7:45 - 8:00	Response to Comments on the Inland Area Remedial Investigation Report - Ronald Yee (EFA WEST)
8:00 - 8:10	Break
8:10 - 8:50	Solid Waste Management Unit Report
8:50 - 8:55	Future Agenda Topics and Action Item Update
8:55 - 9:00	Public Comment
9:00	Adjournment